



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/697,040

10/31/2003

Nobuo Yaegashi

SHO-0035

8364

23353 7590 09/17/2008  
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
LION BUILDING  
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

WONG, JEFFREY KEITH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/17/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/697,040	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAEHASHI, NOBUO	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey K. Wong	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of the Application***

1. This Office-Action acknowledges the Amendment filed on 5/27/2008 and is a response to said Amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al., Japanese Patent JP 2003070979A(Sekine).

Regarding Claim 1.

(Currently Amended) A gaming machine having a front and a rear disposed opposite the front and resting on a horizontal support surface, the gaming machine comprising a medal insertion slot (Title) having an opening for a player to insert a medal for playing a game(Title. In this case, the medal insertion apparatus is for a slot machine), wherein the medal insertion slot comprises a medal guide projection projecting in a forward direction of the gaming (40) machine and configured to guide the medal to the opening, wherein the medal guide projection comprises: an inner peripheral part configured to be in contact with outer peripheral surface of the medal(21. In this case, the recess in



which the medal is placed comes in contact with the outer peripheral surface of the medal); and a pair of projection parts disposed away from each other and projecting on top of both ends of the inner peripheral part(22 and 23), wherein a horizontal line is defined as extending parallel to the horizontal support surface and extending through and between the front and rear of the gaming machine, and wherein an angle between a ridgeline of one of the projection parts and the horizontal line is configured to be different from an angle between a ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice. What the reference fails to teach is of the differing angles of the ridgelines and the projection parts. However, the reference clearly depicts a slot head in which the ridgelines possess differing angles. The rounded/beveled ridgelines clearly show that there can be a plurality of angles between the ridgelines and the projection part, depending on where along the curved surface of the ridgeline in which an angle is determined. The applicant discloses how the angles differ as means of allowing users to more easily insert coins. Moreover, it appears that the coin slot of the reference or the Applicant's instant invention would perform equally well for allowing a user to insert a plurality of coins, which is depicted in fig 6. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified Sekine's invention in order to allow the ease of coin insertion, because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration or for aesthetics



sake, which fails to patentably distinguish over the reference), and wherein the respective ridgelines terminate adjacent the opening at respective heights, the respective heights being at least substantially equal to each other(Fig 9. The picture clearly depicts the ridgelines at respective heights being at least substantially equal to each other. Fig 3, 4, 5, 7 also depict ridgelines that are almost at the same height where the left ridgelines are slightly higher. Those ridgelines can also be viewed as being substantially at equal heights)

.

Regarding Claim 2.

(Original) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 1, wherein the angle between the ridgeline of one of the projection parts and the horizontal line is larger than the angle between the ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 1-8. The depictions show that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts can be viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 3.

(Original) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 1, wherein a height of a start point of the ridgeline of one of the projection parts on a side of the opening is configured to be the same as a height of a start point of the ridgeline of the other projection part on the



Art Unit: 3714

other projection part on a side of the opening(Fig 9. The depictions show that the ridgeline can be configured to be the same height of a start point of the ridgeline of the other projection part. It should also be noted that the height of the start of the ridgelines can viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 4.

(Original) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a frontward projection portion configured to fix the medal insertion slot, wherein an angle between an upper face of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially equal to the angle between the ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 6. The depictions shows that angle the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line can be substantially equal. It should also be noted that the angle between the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line being substantially equal can viewed as an obvious design choice.)

Regarding Claim 5.

(Original)The gaming machine as claimed in claim 1, wherein an angle between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of one of the projection parts and a bottom of the one of the projection parts is configured to be smaller than an angle between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of the other projection part and a bottom of the other projection part(Fig 1-8. The depictions show the angles of the projection parts are different from one another since one projection parts is curved downward near the



front of the projection part and, therefore, the angles can be different)

Regarding Claim 6.

(Currently Amended) A gaming machine having a front and a rear disposed opposite the front and resting on a horizontal support surface, the gaming machine, comprising: a game medium insertion slot having an opening for a player to insert a game medium for playing a game, wherein the opening is formed so that the player can insert the game medium with both sides of the game medium substantially parallel with a front of the gaming machine(Fig 1. The depiction shows that the apparatus is substantially parallel with the front of a gaming machine), wherein the game medium insertion slot includes a game medium guide projection projecting in a forward direction of the gaming machine and configured to guide the game medium to the opening(40), wherein the game medium guide projection includes an inner peripheral part which is a circular arc in a cross section substantially parallel with the front of the gaming machine configured to be in contact with a part of an outer peripheral surface of the game medium (21. The recess has a cross section substantially parallel with the front of a gaming a machine) and a pair of projection parts disposed away from each other and projecting on top of both ends of the inner peripheral part(22 and 23), and wherein a horizontal line is defined as extending parallel to the horizontal support surface and extending through and between the front and rear of the gaming machine, and wherein an angle  $\gamma$  between a ridgeline of one of the projection parts and the horizontal line is configured to be different from an angle  $\beta$  between a ridgeline of the other projection part and the



Art Unit: 3714

horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice) wherein the respective ridgelines terminate adjacent the opening at respective heights, the respective heights being at least substantially equal to each other(Fig 9)

Regarding Claim 7.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, wherein the angle  $\gamma$  between the ridgeline of the right projection part and the horizontal line is larger than the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the left projection part and the horizontal line for inserting the game medium with the right hand of the player.

Regarding Claim 8.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, wherein the angle  $\gamma$  between the ridgeline of the left projection part and the horizontal line is larger than the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the right projection part and the horizontal line for inserting the game medium with the left hand of the player(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the



projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 9.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, wherein a height of a start point of the ridgeline of the one of the projection parts on a side of the opening is configured to be the same as a height of a start point of the ridgeline of the other projection part on the other projection part on a side of the opening (Fig 9. The depiction shows that there height of the start point of the ridgelines of the projection parts can be the same height. It should also be noted that the height of the start of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 10.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, further comprising a frontward projection portion configured to fix the game medium insertion slot, wherein an angle  $\alpha$  between an upper face of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially equal to the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line. (Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that the angle is substantially equal between the ridgelines of the frontward projections. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).



Regarding Claim 11.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, wherein an angle  $\theta_R$  between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of the one of the projection parts and a bottom of the one of the projection parts is configured to be smaller than an angle  $\theta_L$  between the horizontal line and a line connecting a top of the other projection part and a bottom of the other projection part, wherein the respective tops and bottoms are located on respective sides of the respective projection parts. (Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claims 12 and 13.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine as claimed in claim 6, further comprising: a variable display device for variably displaying a plurality of symbols (Title. It is well known in the art that slot machines display a plurality of symbols); an internal lottery device configured to carry out an internal lottery of the game with a random number at a predetermined timing (Title. It is well known in the art that slot machines have a random number generator for generating random outcomes); a stop control device configured to stop at least one of the symbols of the variable display device based on the result of the internal lottery carried out by the internal lottery device (Title. It is well known in the art that slot machines have a stop device such as a stop button for stopping at least one of the plurality of symbols); and a game medium payout device configured to pay out the



game medium to the player in a case where a stop state of the variable display device stopped by the stop control device corresponds to a predetermined stop state(Title. It is well known in the art that slot machines payout according to the stop state of the plurality of the symbols based

Regarding Claim 14.

(Currently Amended) A gaming machine having a front and a rear disposed opposite the front and resting on a horizontal support surface, the gaming machine, comprising: a game medium insertion slot having an opening for a player to insert a game medium for playing a game(Title), wherein the game medium insertion slot comprises a game medium guide projection projecting in a forward direction of the gaming machine and configured to guide the game medium to the opening(40), wherein the game medium guide projection includes: an inner peripheral part configured to be in contact with outer peripheral surface of the game medium(24. The slot in which the medal enters is in contact with the outer peripheral surface of the game medium); and first and second projection parts disposed away from each other and projecting on top of both ends of the inner peripheral part(22 and 23), wherein a horizontal line is defined as extending parallel to the horizontal support surface and extending through and between the front and rear of the gaming machine, wherein an angle  $\gamma$  between a ridgeline of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be different from an angle  $\beta$  between a ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of



Art Unit: 3714

the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice), wherein the first projection part has a side surface that is curved downward along a widthwise direction of the gaming machine(Fig 7. The depiction shows that the first projection is curved downward), and wherein an angle  $\theta_R$  between a line connecting a top and a bottom of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be smaller than an angle  $\theta_L$  between a line connecting a top and a bottom of the second projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice) wherein the respective ridgelines terminate adjacent the opening at respective heights, the respective heights being at least substantially equal to each other(Fig 9.)

Regarding Claim 15.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 14, wherein the second projection part has a side surface that is curved downward along the widthwise direction(Fig 7. The depiction shows that the second projection part is curved downward), and wherein the side surface of the first projection part has a part having a curvature smaller than that of the side surface of the second projection part in a plane perpendicular to the horizontal line and parallel to the widthwise direction(Fig 7. The depiction show that the curvature is smaller than the curvature of the first projection



part. It should also be noted that the curvature of the first or second projection parts is viewed as a design choice).

Regarding Claim 16.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 15, wherein the first projection part is disposed at a right side to the player with respect to the second projection part(Fig 1).

Regarding Claim 17.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 14, wherein the angle  $\gamma$  between the ridgeline of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be larger than the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 18.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 14, wherein a height of the ridgeline of the first projection part at an end near to the opening is configured to be same with a height of the ridgeline of the second projection part at an end near to the opening(Fig 9. The depiction shows that the height of the ridgeline of the projections is



Art Unit: 3714

the same. It should also be noted that the height of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 19.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 14 further comprising a frontward projection portion on which the game medium insertion slot is mounted, wherein an angle  $\alpha$  between an upper surface of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially same with the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line (Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that the angle is substantially the same between the ridgelines of the frontward projections. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 20.

(Currently Amended) A gaming machine having a front and a rear disposed opposite the front and resting on a horizontal support surface, the gaming machine, comprising: a game medium insertion slot having an opening for a player to insert a game medium for playing a game(24); and a frontward projection portion on which the game medium insertion slot is mounted, wherein the game medium insertion slot comprises a game medium guide projection projecting in a forward direction of the gaming machine and configured to guide the game medium to the opening(40), wherein the game medium



Art Unit: 3714

guide projection includes: an inner peripheral part configured to be in contact with outer peripheral surface of the game medium(30); and first and second projection parts disposed away from each other and projecting on top of both ends of the inner peripheral part(22 and 23), wherein the first projection part is disposed at a right side to the player with respect to the second projection part(Fig 1), wherein a horizontal line is defined as extending parallel to the horizontal support surface and extending through and between the front and rear of the gaming machine, wherein an angle  $\gamma$  between a ridgeline of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be larger than an angle  $\beta$  between a ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice), wherein a height of the ridgeline of the first projection part at an end near to the opening is configured to be same with a height of the ridgeline of the second projection part at an end near to the opening(Fig 9), wherein the first projection part has a side surface that is curved downward along a widthwise direction of the gaming machine(Fig 7. The depiction shows the first projection is curved downward), wherein the second projection part has a side surface that is curved downward along the widthwise direction(Fig 7. The depiction shows the second projection is curved downward), wherein the side surface of the first projection part has a part having a curvature smaller than that of the side surface of the second projection part in a plane perpendicular to the horizontal line and parallel to the widthwise



Art Unit: 3714

direction, wherein an angle  $\theta_R$  between a line connecting a top and a bottom of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be smaller than an angle  $\theta_L$  between a line connecting a top and a bottom of the second projection part and the horizontal line (Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice), and wherein an angle  $\alpha$  between an upper surface of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially same with the angle  $\alpha$  between the ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line (Fig 6. The depictions shows that angle the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line can be substantially equal. It should also be noted that the angle between the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line being substantially equal can viewed as an obvious design choice.)

Regarding Claim 21.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 20, wherein the second projection part has a side surface that is curved downward along the widthwise direction (Fig 7. The depiction shows that the second projection part is curved downward), and wherein the side surface of the first projection part has a part having a curvature smaller than that of the side surface of the second projection part in a plane perpendicular to the horizontal line and parallel to the widthwise direction (Fig 7. The depiction show that the curvature is smaller than the curvature of the first projection



Art Unit: 3714

part. It should also be noted that the curvature of the first or second projection parts is viewed as a design choice).

Regarding Claim 22.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 21, wherein the first projection part is disposed at a right side to the player with respect to the second projection part.

Regarding Claim 23.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 20, wherein the angle  $\gamma$  between the ridgeline of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be larger than the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that there is an obvious angle difference between the ridgeline of the two projection parts and the horizontal line. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 24.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 20, wherein a height of the ridgeline of the first projection part at an end near to the opening is configured to be same with a height of the ridgeline of the second projection part at an end near to the opening(Fig 9. The depiction shows that there height of the start point of the ridgelines



of the projection parts can be the same height. It should also be noted that the height of the start of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

Regarding Claim 25.

(Previously Presented) The gaming machine according to claim 20 further comprising a frontward projection portion on which the game medium insertion slot is mounted(Fig 1), wherein an angle  $\alpha$  between an upper surface of the frontward projection portion and the horizontal line is configured to be substantially same with the angle  $\beta$  between the ridgeline of the second projection part and the horizontal line.(Fig 4 and Fig 5. The depiction shows that the angle is substantially equal between the ridgelines of the frontward projections. It should also be noted that the angles of the projection parts is viewed as an obvious design choice).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant alleges that a skilled person would not be motivated to form the ridgelines of the right and left walls (projection parts) to be substantially equal to each other at the side adjacent the opening. The Examiner disagrees. Fig 9 of the reference clearly depicts ridgelines at substantially equal to each other.
5. Applicant alleges that the reference fails to disclose of the angles between a ridgeline of one of the projection parts and a horizontal line to be different/smaller/larger



Art Unit: 3714

from an angle between a ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line, of the angles  $\gamma$  between a ridgeline of one of the projection parts and a horizontal line to be different/smaller/larger from an angle between a ridgeline of the other projection part and the horizontal line, of the angles  $\theta_R$  between a line connecting a top and bottom of the first projection part and the horizontal line is configured to be different/smaller/larger than an angle  $\theta_L$  between a line connecting a top and a bottom of the second projection part and the horizontal line. The Examiner disagrees. What the reference fails to teach is of the differing angles of the ridgelines and the projection parts. However, the reference clearly depicts a slot head in which the ridgelines possess differing angles, fig 3, 4, 5, 7. The rounded/beveled ridgelines clearly show that there can be a plurality of angles between the ridgelines and the projection part, depending on where along the curved surface of the ridgeline in which an angle is determined. The applicant discloses how the angles differ as means of allowing users to more easily insert coins. Moreover, it appears that the coin slot of the reference and the Applicant's instant invention would perform equally well for allowing a user to insert a plurality of coins, which is depicted in fig 6. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have modified Sekine's invention in order to allow the ease of coin insertion or for aesthetics sake, because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration, which fails to patentably distinguish over the reference)

The Examiner has no provided an affidavit because Applicants have specified in which particular official notice to which said Applicants do not acquiesce.



***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
7. Atronic Gaming Machine WBC Video Operation Manual, Aug 1999. Page 15 of the Spare Parts section. Item 1, Part #65003571: Coin Entry Housing Untreated
8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey K. Wong whose telephone number is (571)270-3003. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30am-7:00pm.



Art Unit: 3714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hotaling can be reached on (571)272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

JKW